

The Sun

THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 1897.

Subscriptions by Mail Post-Paid.
 DAILY, per Month, \$3.00
 DAILY, per Year, \$30.00
 SUNDAY, per Year, \$5.00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Month, \$1.00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Year, \$10.00
 Postage to foreign countries added.
 THE SUN, New York City.
 PARK—Kingsway No. 15, Near Grand Hotel.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication will have their articles returned they must in all cases be accompanied by a return address.

LOCAL NEWS.—The City and Suburban News Bureau of the United Press and New York Associated Press is at 21 to 29 Ann street. All information and documents for publication will be promptly disseminated to the press of the whole country.

Maine the Defendant, Sweden the Judge and Jury.

The lossess with which the Olney-Panncofote treaty has been drawn, and its disregard for reserved rights and Constitutional provisions, are strikingly illustrated in the case here supposed.

Suppose that instead of Queen Victoria living in New Brunswick have claims against the State of Maine aggregating \$400,000 and all depending upon the same question of law or set of facts. Suppose that these claims become the subject of diplomatic negotiation between London and Washington.

If they were disputed at Washington, under the proposed treaty they would go to arbitration according to the provisions of Articles II. and III. as follows:

ARTICLE II.—All pecuniary claims or groups of pecuniary claims, which do not in the aggregate exceed \$100,000 in amount, and which do not involve the determination of territorial claims, shall be dealt with and decided by an arbitral tribunal, constituted as provided in the following article.

ARTICLE III.—Each of the high contracting parties shall nominate one arbitrator who shall be a just and reputable, and the two arbitrators so named shall within two months of their nomination select an umpire. In case they shall fail to do so within the limit of time above mentioned, the umpire shall be appointed by agreement between the members for the time being of the Supreme Court of the United States and the members for the time being of the judicial committee of the Privy Council in Great Britain, each nominating a body acting by a majority. In case they shall fail to agree upon an umpire within three months of the date of an application made to them in that behalf by the high contracting party, the umpire shall be selected in the manner provided for in Article X.

Article X.—He referred to, provides:

"In any case the nominating bodies designated in Articles II. and III. shall fail to agree upon an umpire in accordance with the provisions of said article, the umpire shall be appointed by His Majesty the King of Sweden and Norway."

And then Article III. continues:

"The person so selected shall be the President of the tribunal, and the majority of the members thereof shall be final."

The umpire will be the tribunal, for his determining vote will decide the claim of the subjects of Queen Victoria living in New Brunswick against the State of Maine. In the event contemplated by Article X. the case we are supposing would be decided finally for or against Maine by King Oscar of Sweden, through his appointed representative in the tribunal.

It would be incredible that a treaty prepared and advocated by an American Secretary of State proposed to drag one of the States of this Union as a defendant before one of the monarchs of Europe, if Article VIII. were not clear as to that point:

ARTICLE VIII.—In case where the question involved is one which concerns a particular State or Territory of the United States, it shall be open to the President of the United States to appoint a judicial officer of such State or Territory to be one of the arbitrators, under Article III. or Article V. or Article VI.

Thus the State concerned is made a party to the proceedings, and the decision of Sweden is final, the United States becoming responsible for the execution of the judgment. That this provision contemplated the collection of British claims against a State of the Union is shown by the mention of Article III., which, as will be seen above, relates only to pecuniary claims.

But the Eleventh Amendment of the United States Constitution says:

"The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit of law or equity commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign State."

Practically, therefore, and perhaps strictly and technically, the wonderful Olney-Panncofote treaty erects an extra-judicial and foreign tribunal, with jurisdiction over the rights and interests of the individual States of this Union; a jurisdiction which the Constitution of the United States expressly denies even to the United States Courts themselves.

No hurry about this treaty; let the light through it first!

The Proposed Arbitration Treaty.

Several questions suggest themselves in connection with the general arbitration treaty, which, although signed by Mr. OLNEY and Sir JULIAN PANNCOFOTE, is as yet, of course, merely inchoate. These questions will have to be answered to the satisfaction of the Senate and the country before the treaty is confirmed. Meanwhile, ample time undoubtedly will be afforded for their thorough consideration.

In the first place, one is prompted to inquire why a treaty binding us to refer to arbitration all controversies that may arise hereafter between the United States and Great Britain should be concluded at this particular time? There is now no subject of dispute between the two countries requiring an immediate settlement, as was the case in the matter of the Alabama claims, or in the difference regarding the seal fishery in the Behring Sea. On neither of those occasions did we deem it needful or expedient to commit ourselves to a general arbitration agreement; we were then of the opinion that sufficient unto the day is the disposal thereof, and that a specific agreement to arbitrate *ad hoc* would answer our immediate purpose. How does it happen, then, that our State Department should just now endeavor to fasten upon us a general arbitration agreement in the absence of any pressing necessity? Can it be possible that our offer to arbitrate to arbitration all our own future disputes with Great Britain was of the nature of a bribe, tendered by Mr. OLNEY to induce Lord SALISBURY to arbitrate England's controversy with Venezuela? If so, the vaunted settlement of the Venezuela question, far from being a triumph of American diplomacy, is a gross piece of deception practised upon the people of the United States.

Touching this point, it should be remembered that Lord SALISBURY was personally responsible for the persistence of the boundary quarrel between British Guiana and Venezuela. In May, 1885, Lord GRAYVILLE had pledged himself to allow the title to the whole of the territory in dispute to be determined by arbitration; but Lord SALISBURY, on his accession to power,

although he declared in the House of Lords that he would carry out his predecessor's agreements, broke the compact with Venezuela, for the reason, apparently, that the existence of rich gold deposits in the debatable land had been made known to the British Foreign Office. If, then, he had adhered to the refusal embodied in his well-known despatch to Mr. OLNEY, the refusal to refer to arbitration any of the territory east of the Schomburgk line, the whole responsibility for the war, which then would have been inevitable, would have rested on the shoulders of Lord SALISBURY. By such a contest England undoubtedly would have lost British North America, and the statesman chargeable with such a sacrifice would have been pilloried in British history by the side of Lord NORTH. On the other hand, how could Lord SALISBURY retreat completely from the ground taken in the despatch referred to without losing the respect of his own followers, who would say either that the ground was originally taken without due deliberation, or that his complete retreat from it was a proof of pusillanimity. He seemed, therefore, to be caught in a vise between two alternatives, neither of which could be embraced with safety or honor.

Is it not evident that Mr. OLNEY, by offering or accepting an agreement to couple with the Venezuela treaty a general arbitration treaty between the United States and England, furnished Lord SALISBURY a golden bridge across the yawning abyss which threatened to engulf his reputation? Will not an examination of the dates and dates of the official despatches show that up to the time when Mr. OLNEY evinced a disposition to sign a general arbitration treaty between the United States and England, there was no indication of a willingness on Lord SALISBURY's part to swallow his previous words, and assent to a rightful and decent arrangement with a weak South American republic? We believe that a careful review of the official correspondence, and of all the circumstances antecedent and incident thereto, will convince the Senate and the American people that Mr. OLNEY's promise to sign a general arbitration treaty between the United States and England was nothing more nor less than a bribe, and that, without the bribe, Lord SALISBURY never would have consented to sign the specific arbitration treaty with Venezuela.

Now, who authorized Mr. OLNEY or his Master, Mr. CLEVELAND, to bribe the British Government to perform an act of justice? What right had the President of the United States to come to Washington in the winter of 1894-95 to advocate a general arbitration agreement between the United States and England, they were laughed out of court by our House of Representatives. When, on Dec. 17, 1895, Mr. CLEVELAND sent to Congress his Venezuela message, there was not a word in that document about purchasing England's consent to recognize the rights of a South American republic by an agreement to refer all our own controversies with Great Britain to a tribunal wherein, in all important matters, a European should have the casting vote. Had Mr. CLEVELAND's message even hinted at such an extraordinary proposal, it would have met with a very different reception from both houses of Congress. The United States are not in the business of bribing other nations to do their duty. What Mr. CLEVELAND said, and what Congress and the country repeated with wonderful unanimity and emphasis, was that if upon due inquiry Venezuela seemed to us to have a *prima facie* case, the United States would be bound to make a back-down easy for Lord SALISBURY. The dimensions do not explicitly appear upon the face of the treaty, but we may be certain that the Senate and the country will want to know precisely what they are before they consent to a confirmation of the agreement. Does the treaty bind us to refer the boundary of Alaska, and the ownership of an extensive gold-bearing region, to a tribunal where a European would have the casting vote? Does the treaty bind us to submit to such a tribunal the Monroe doctrine, or, in other words, our determination to defend every Latin American republic against territorial dismemberment at the hands of any European monarchy? Would it bind us, upon the plea that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty is still valid, to allow such a tribunal to determine whether we have a right to construct and control a Nicaragua canal? Does it bind us to let such a tribunal settle the fisheries question, which still remains open between ourselves and the Dominion of Canada? Does it bind us to let a board of arbitrators, constituted with a European majority, say whether or not we might well come with open arms some or all of the Canadian provinces, should these at some future day desire to become members of the Union? How far, in a word, have Messrs. CLEVELAND and OLNEY been willing to mortgage our vital interests and our splendid possibilities for the sake of the selfish satisfaction of finishing the Venezuelan business with a semblance of success?

These are questions which every patriotic and far-sighted American will expect to hear answered adequately; and in its own interest the Senate will do well to discuss matters of such moment in open session.

Brooklyn's Political Importance.

Brooklyn and Kings county, the political boundaries of which are now identical, gave a Republican majority of 16,000 in 1894, a Democratic majority of 7,000 in 1895, and a Republican majority on Governor of 29,000 in 1896. This year, in addition to participation in the election of a Mayor and comptroller for the Greater New York, Brooklyn will vote for a Sheriff to succeed WILLIAM J. BULLING, for a Register to succeed GRANTVILLE HARRIS, and for a County Clerk to succeed JACOB WORTH, appointed by the Governor to fill a vacancy. Sundry local offices, provided for under the proposed Greater New York charter, are also to be filled.

From present appearances Brooklyn will have an important, if not decisive, influence in the elections in the consolidated town. The voting population of Kings has been growing rapidly of late years, and is greater proportionately to the total population than that of New York, probably because of the smaller relative numbers of aliens and of transient inhabitants. In the municipal election of ten years ago in Brooklyn, when Mr. CHAPIN was chosen Mayor by a plurality of less than 900 votes, the total vote of that city was 118,447, and the county towns, which then participated in the election of the county officers, but not of the municipal officers, and since have been annexed to Brooklyn, as wards, cast collectively 3,808 votes, bringing up the total of Kings county to 122,000, the total vote of New York city at the same election being 216,000. At the recent election the total vote of Brooklyn, or Kings county, was 194,000, and that of New York 308,000, showing an increase in ten years of 72,000 in Brooklyn, and 92,000 in New York. Proportionately, of course, the increase in the voting population of Brooklyn has been much more rapid than in New York, and the returns of recent elections would seem to indicate that the independent vote, which is not clearly or firmly attached to either political party, is relatively larger in Brooklyn than in New York.

Brooklyn will have an important share in this year's municipal contest, and the political leaders of both parties have already begun their preparations.

The Good Name of Congress.

The Hon. WILLIAM L. WILSON, who, as the leader of the House of Representatives, chosen in 1892 to perform the promises of the CLEVELAND campaign, has been a choice subject of Mugwump flattery, has at last turned on his friends with deprecation of their persistent abuse of all public men except their own idols. He spoke a good word for Congress, at Albany on Tuesday, before the New York Bar Association. "It will not do," said Mr. WILSON, "for us to censure too rashly those who have chosen to act for us in the two branches of Congress."

So far Mr. WILSON nerved himself to say the right thing, notwithstanding that at the moment the Mugwumps were in full howl at everything political in this country, except, as usual, themselves and theirs. It was highly creditable for the speaker, who, for a few months at least, sits snug in a Cabinet place, to defend the national legislature against the assaults of his fanatical friends, but he thereby revealed his glaring failure to meet the situation with equal frankness, and to expose the particular instances of Congress' discredit, with which he was personally connected. The House of Representatives, in which Mr. WILSON was the leader of the Democratic majority and the lieutenant of President CLEVELAND, was pledged to the principle of a tariff for revenue only, but the first move under that promise was the introduction of a tariff bill steeped in protection, and unblushingly defended as such by Chairman WILSON's own voice. Such was the answer of the two most eminent Mugwump statesmen to the Democratic party's solemn promise, and the great force of the Administration was next applied to drive this same tariff bill through Congress. On the top of that President CLEVELAND turned down all records of political treachery into oblivion by proposing the Populist plank for an income tax, and that, too, became a part of the Democratic programme. The Wilson bill made the Fifty-third Congress dishonest and disgraced, and much of the toleration with which the public has endured the Mugwump tirades is due to that lamentable result.

"If there is blame or weakness anywhere," continued Mr. WILSON, "it is with those who elect rather than with those who are elected." Mr. WILSON here slandered the people of the United States by way of screening his own followers. It was the elect, not the electors, who did the deed of shame in his case, and to the Congress of to-day, which is suffering in its repute for the sins of its predecessor, Mr. WILSON owes the reparation of a full and formal confession of the unparalleled dishonesty in legislation for which he and Mr. CLEVELAND were directly responsible. Confession of the guilty is the final stage of vindication of the innocent.

The Janitor of the Peninsula.

The two many-antlered stags, persuasively rampant, which hold up the signposts of the State of Michigan, are especially significant this year. They are the symbols of the Hon. POTATO PINGREE, the double role of politics, the Mayor of Detroit and the Governor of Michigan. "Tutor," "I will take care of things," is the label. They include other observations pertinent to the present state of stags and men in the PINGREE reserves. They make, in Latin, a language unworthy of the greatest of Governors and printed in more than doubtful type, remarks which seem to say in the vulgar tongue: "If you're playing for a nice little peninsula—*peninsula amocnam*—won't you please to give Michigan the eye?" (*circumpecte*). On the outside of a message sent by a practical statesman like Governor the Hon. POTATO PINGREE, this motto seems to be too poetical. But the first page of his message shows that he combines business with poetry. "It remains within your power," he tells the legislators at Lansing, "to make the coming session of the Legislature an ideal one." This ideal is to be attained "by the enactment of a few laws which will meet the approval of all patriotic citizens of this State and the commendation of every true member of our great republic."

How to secure this ideal? Read the message. The Hon. POTATO PINGREE, whose commanding position in the peninsula which he circumplexes is due entirely to his own merit, without help from any machine whatever, except one or two, frankly recommends the abolition of party conventions. "The convention," he remarks with just indignation, "has become the medium of trickery, bribery, and fraud. The higher criminal is here developed." The Governor's modesty prevents him from saying that a good man can get the better of this medium of trickery, bribery, and fraud. Last year he himself showed the way to bring trickery, bribery, and fraud to shame, and to prevent the development of the higher criminal. Having succeeded, after several efforts, in being nominated by the Michigan Republican State Convention for Governor, on the gold platform, he kindly allowed gold and silver people to vote for him, and, after the cruel war was over, announced with characteristic boldness that he was still a silver man. We differ with regret from an original statesman like the Hon. POTATO PINGREE, but it is necessary to abolish party conventions so long as a man can use the party machinery to get a nomination on the strength of the belief that he is for white, and, after he is elected, conveniently show that he is for black? Mr. PINGREE is an altruist, and perhaps he is justified in imagining that political conventions will not be as good to others as they have been to him; but the Michigan Legislature has too much trust in him to trust his observations about the iniquity of political conventions.

What does a renowned economist like the

Hon. POTATO PINGREE think about taxation? "I recommend," he says, "that steps be taken, in the form of local or general taxation, to make corporations bear their proper share of the tax." These are the words of a great political economist. It is a matter of common observation that corporations pay too meagre taxes, and unincorporated boot and shoe manufacturers, for instance, excessive taxes.

No great economist thinks long without thinking about railroads. Consequently the Hon. POTATO PINGREE recommends that "the Legislature take into consideration the question of passenger fares, at two cents a mile, for Michigan." It is an important subject, and doubtless a wise recommendation. But the greatest good of the greatest number ought to be considered. More Michigan people wear boots and shoes than can possibly reach the Michigan railroads. Ought not the price of boots and shoes to be fixed by the Legislature at a minimum rate of a dollar a pair?

"There is growing up in this country a system of trusts and combinations which is becoming more and more impudent and extortionate." This has been said before, but has not been entirely believed until now. The Hon. POTATO PINGREE says it, and it sticks deeply into a million minds. Perhaps the full iniquity of trusts was not until even he took the trouble to remark that by trusts the "consuming power of the people is destroyed." But have they not still his messages to consume? It is he who points out that "the employment of children in many lines of work" is "another of the results of the concentration of capital in trusts and monopolies." This is a novel view, but "the greed and avarice of those who thirst for wealth and power is so great that the weak and the helpless are forgotten, and those who have felt interested enough in the uplifting of their fellow beings to consider these questions seriously must unite in combating the evils" to which the Governor has referred.

Among these evils is the baneful influence of public corporations upon the independence of the voter. Governor PINGREE advises the Legislature to pass a law which will fix a penalty severe enough to deter these corporations from "exerting undue influence in elections." But who can tell what evil deed a corporation will do. "Incorporated bodies," says the Governor, "walk into the capital of the State and almost openly pay for the privilege of escaping taxation." Their insolence must be rebuffed. For instance, their writer and their lobbyist, by the local authorities in every town, and the right to regulate fares on street railways should be reserved. But this is not all, as Governor PINGREE well says:

"Permit me to give another illustration. The amount actually invested in a plant is one million dollars. After the road is completed it is mortgaged and bonded for two millions. This could only be done by creating a mortgage on the property itself. In other words, the three men who formed the company and their associates advanced a million dollars and immediately thereafter placed a mortgage upon the industry and earnings of every inhabitant of the city for three years to come to the injury of every citizen. Then when the question of regulating the fares is brought up the municipal authorities are met with the bland statement that the original owners do not pay taxes on the property, and are in a position to pay the taxes of a million dollars and the interest upon it for thirty years, the company cannot live for the fare is reduced."

This form of mortgage, which is put on in every city in this State, and hundreds of millions of dollars of fictitious values, which must represent some form of human labor, have been created for a few by the simple stroke of the pen, and in order to pay these imaginary debts have laid upon every man, woman, and child in the country. It simply means that these hundreds of millions of dollars are to be taken from the ordinary channels of legitimate trade to the injury of every mercantile and manufacturing and farming industry in the land, for no one interest can suffer without a corresponding injury to all. Is it not strange that in every city in this State, and in every town, there should be a concentration, learned financiers, wise statesmen, and profound political scholars wonder why the few who are so rich and the many who are so poor?

Surely this is a simple way of preventing the many from becoming poor, and learned financiers, wise statesmen, and profound political economists from wasting on wonder what is meant for mankind.

The Hon. POTATO PINGREE's views of education are worthy of his enlightened mind. He wishes well to the University of Michigan. He desires that its teachers shall be free of monopoly and emitters of improving thought:

"The teachers should be equal in any of the world and they should be men of independent thought, ready to stand up for the rights of the people, and to advance civilization and advancement with an intelligent and enlightened public spirit. They should be qualified to aid in the preparation of wise measures of Government and to witness at all times the progress of political and economic development. They should be highly respected and so well compensated that it would not be profitable, as soon as they become efficient, to be called away to give instruction to some great teacher, who would not conform to the monopoly, who have acquired tens of millions of dollars at the expense of tens of thousands of their fellow men."

This seems to be a decent but none the less powerful attack upon the Chicago University. Monopolists who have acquired millions of dollars at the expense of their fellow men may continue to give money to that institution, but the Hon. POTATO PINGREE warns them away from Ann Arbor. His views are always interesting, and his notions of education are doubly valuable when they are so well shown to be in these golden sentences:

"While it may not be possible to greatly extend your support."

"Accurate and detailed reports of the exact condition of the corporation and the value of its assets should be made at stated periods, and the statements made in them be carefully examined."

"Great care should be taken in preventing corporate bodies from coming into existence on values that are not based on the actual value of the property, and that should be sold at a fair price."

"Many worthless corporations are organized, electing for their president a person of well-known financial strength."

On the whole, it appears safe to say that the first message of Governor PINGREE is worthy of the renown of its author. His circumspection of the amene peninsula is searching and complete.

For the Medical Faculty.

President WILSON of the Health Department has issued a pamphlet upon "The Legal Duties of Physicians, Undertakers, and Cemetery Keepers." Though these duties ought to be well known to all concerned, they are in many cases disregarded; and it is most desirable that the health officers of the city should hereafter manifest more vigilance in the enforcement of the laws relating to them.

The first legal provision quoted in the pamphlet is that "all physicians practicing in New York city must be registered in the Health Department." Yet we have not a doubt that there are hundreds of unregistered practitioners in the city, who abound in the tenement quarter, on the east side. Very often they do not possess medical diplomas that accord with the terms of the law; they are sometimes chargeable with illegal practices; they use nostrums of a baneful character; they deceive their patients; death doubtless is due often to their ignorance. It is

the duty of the Health Department to search out these law-breakers of both sexes; and we trust that the publication of President WILSON's pamphlet may be regarded as a sign that more attention will this year be paid to this subject. Some years ago the County Medical Society rendered good service in securing the arrest of unlawful practitioners, but we fear that its activity in this direction has come to an end. It may have been a difficult thing to catch and to handle the evil-doers. The society yet, however, can give help to the Health Department. It is the duty of an honorable physician to make report at that department of any medical charlatans who may be known to him as such.

Besides the statement of the legal duties of the members of the medical faculty, the pamphlet contains the rules and regulations for their guidance in the case of certain maladies; and all physicians ought to be possessed of the information thus furnished.

As the pamphlet can be obtained gratuitously at the Health Department, every practitioner in the city ought to make himself acquainted with its contents.

Turrets for Homer Shoals.

The bill which Mr. FISCHER has prepared for Congress, authorizing a Board of Army Engineers to report upon the feasibility and cost of placing armored turrets on Homer Shoals, in New York harbor, is intended to carry out a plan which has been contemplated and discussed for many years.

Romer Shoals lie in a line between Sandy Hook and Connetquot Island. At the ends of this line there will be combinations of heavy guns and mortars which will do execution upon any hostile fleet which attempts to pass between them and go on to the Narrows, where it would have to run the second gauntlet of Forts Wadsworth and Hamilton. But in addition it has been proposed to construct three circular armored forts on the shoals, which would completely command Gedney's Channel, the South Channel, and the Main Channel, so rendering the defenses of New York on that side practically impregnable.

Should such turrets be erected, presumably they would be supplied with 16-inch guns. The type piece of this enormous calibre was provided for at the last session of Congress, and it may be added that the Navy Department long ago put down 16-inch guns among the needs of New York and a few other ports.

It is, of course, to be supposed that the Engineer Corps would in any case duly make an examination of the Homer Shoals proposal. It has long been before it, but has not been urgent while so much work was needed on sites already chosen. Still, the bill of Mr. FISCHER will direct renewed attention to the subject.

The application of installment plan methods to Majority messages, prescribed by law for formal communication to the Board of Aldermen, may be said to have originated in this town with the Hon. ARTHUR STEVENS HERRICK.

For instance, the Hon. ARTHUR STEVENS HERRICK, who was elected Mayor of New York in 1895, was put to a supreme test during his two years' service as Mayor. The first fragment of the message of Mayor STEVENS, the first serial in the chronicles of LYONS, made its appearance on Jan. 12, and related to the Finance and Law departments. The second fragment, which appeared on Tuesday, Jan. 19, one week later, and referred to the Health Department, the Board of City Record, and the Board of Education. There are forty-eight city departments, and the appearance of serial messages, on successive Tuesdays, taking three departments in a group at a time, would not have been a very important schedule, twelve weeks or thereabouts.

Some weeks, perhaps, before the last of the serials the Legislature in Albany will have acted on the Greater New York charter, doing away with the Board of Aldermen, as such, and providing for a Mayor in the territory which no longer will be a city, but a county. The Mayor, the Newtown Creek, the Hudson River, or New York Bay as points of political division.

Tuesdays in January, February, and March will be Aldermanic "at home" this year for the reading of the Mayor's message.

We are very well pleased to learn that the President of the black republic of Hayti, who was elected in April last, and who has manifested that he is much better qualified for civil rule than was his predecessor, President HIPPOLYTE, whose government was largely of a military character. Hayti is getting along very well at this time, and its people are peacefully disposed, largely on account of the disinterestedness of its President. The President has been elected to the highest position in the country, and there were apprehensions of tumult and revolution; but all troubles were averted. After he had taken his place he granted a general amnesty, chose a Ministry of conciliation, permitted the exiles at Jamaica to return home, and in his efforts to settle the country he has been able to make the exiles of France, Minister to France. His rule is one of firmness, not less than of accommodation, and it is constitutional, in its important features. We wish well to our black neighbor, and good luck to President SIMON-SAM.

THE PROPOSED BEER STANDARD.

An Argument That the Horton Bill Is Unjust to New York Brewers.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Permit me to call your attention to the fact that in your letter from Albany on the Horton bill, proposing an official beer standard, a very important point was overlooked. Without going into the merits of the bill as it stands, it will be seen at once that the measure discriminates against the New York brewing industry in favor of the brewers of other States. This is of course unintentional, but it is a fact, nevertheless.

Leaving aside the question whether beer brewed in accordance with the regulations of the State would be better than beer brewed in other States, it is certain that it would be much more expensive. Thus the market our brewers have built up in New Jersey, the New England States, and even more distant points in the interior, would be destroyed at one stroke. It would be utterly impossible to compete with the brewers of other States where no similar law exists. For the same reason the steadily growing export of bottled beer would be killed; the New York brewers would be underbid by their competitors in other States and lose their market there, where, after years of strenuous and costly efforts, they have just begun to gain a foothold.

The bill proposed would not only prevent the sale of beer brewed in other States, but the sale of beer brewed in other States where such vigorous regulations do not exist. The beer brewed in New York would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere, and it would not only continue to send our brewers out of the business, but it would drive New York brewers out of the business. The State of New York has not the power to prescribe how beer brewed in other States should be sold, nor can it be forbidden to bring beer brewed in other States into the State of New York. The State has no right to interfere with the sale of beer brewed in other States, and it cannot shut out certain qualities of beer from other States. It would require a Federal law to do this, and it would be a very serious matter if such a law were passed. The proposed New York standard, how could it be accomplished? All New York brewers would be required to produce their beer in accordance with the regulations of the State, and they would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere. It is a fact, however, that the beer brewed in New York would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere, and it would not only continue to send our brewers out of the business, but it would drive New York brewers out of the business. The State of New York has not the power to prescribe how beer brewed in other States should be sold, nor can it be forbidden to bring beer brewed in other States into the State of New York. The State has no right to interfere with the sale of beer brewed in other States, and it cannot shut out certain qualities of beer from other States. It would require a Federal law to do this, and it would be a very serious matter if such a law were passed. The proposed New York standard, how could it be accomplished? All New York brewers would be required to produce their beer in accordance with the regulations of the State, and they would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere. It is a fact, however, that the beer brewed in New York would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere, and it would not only continue to send our brewers out of the business, but it would drive New York brewers out of the business. The State of New York has not the power to prescribe how beer brewed in other States should be sold, nor can it be forbidden to bring beer brewed in other States into the State of New York. The State has no right to interfere with the sale of beer brewed in other States, and it cannot shut out certain qualities of beer from other States. It would require a Federal law to do this, and it would be a very serious matter if such a law were passed. The proposed New York standard, how could it be accomplished? All New York brewers would be required to produce their beer in accordance with the regulations of the State, and they would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere. It is a fact, however, that the beer brewed in New York would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere, and it would not only continue to send our brewers out of the business, but it would drive New York brewers out of the business. The State of New York has not the power to prescribe how beer brewed in other States should be sold, nor can it be forbidden to bring beer brewed in other States into the State of New York. The State has no right to interfere with the sale of beer brewed in other States, and it cannot shut out certain qualities of beer from other States. It would require a Federal law to do this, and it would be a very serious matter if such a law were passed. The proposed New York standard, how could it be accomplished? All New York brewers would be required to produce their beer in accordance with the regulations of the State, and they would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere. It is a fact, however, that the beer brewed in New York would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere, and it would not only continue to send our brewers out of the business, but it would drive New York brewers out of the business. The State of New York has not the power to prescribe how beer brewed in other States should be sold, nor can it be forbidden to bring beer brewed in other States into the State of New York. The State has no right to interfere with the sale of beer brewed in other States, and it cannot shut out certain qualities of beer from other States. It would require a Federal law to do this, and it would be a very serious matter if such a law were passed. The proposed New York standard, how could it be accomplished? All New York brewers would be required to produce their beer in accordance with the regulations of the State, and they would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere. It is a fact, however, that the beer brewed in New York would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere, and it would not only continue to send our brewers out of the business, but it would drive New York brewers out of the business. The State of New York has not the power to prescribe how beer brewed in other States should be sold, nor can it be forbidden to bring beer brewed in other States into the State of New York. The State has no right to interfere with the sale of beer brewed in other States, and it cannot shut out certain qualities of beer from other States. It would require a Federal law to do this, and it would be a very serious matter if such a law were passed. The proposed New York standard, how could it be accomplished? All New York brewers would be required to produce their beer in accordance with the regulations of the State, and they would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere. It is a fact, however, that the beer brewed in New York would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere, and it would not only continue to send our brewers out of the business, but it would drive New York brewers out of the business. The State of New York has not the power to prescribe how beer brewed in other States should be sold, nor can it be forbidden to bring beer brewed in other States into the State of New York. The State has no right to interfere with the sale of beer brewed in other States, and it cannot shut out certain qualities of beer from other States. It would require a Federal law to do this, and it would be a very serious matter if such a law were passed. The proposed New York standard, how could it be accomplished? All New York brewers would be required to produce their beer in accordance with the regulations of the State, and they would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere. It is a fact, however, that the beer brewed in New York would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere, and it would not only continue to send our brewers out of the business, but it would drive New York brewers out of the business. The State of New York has not the power to prescribe how beer brewed in other States should be sold, nor can it be forbidden to bring beer brewed in other States into the State of New York. The State has no right to interfere with the sale of beer brewed in other States, and it cannot shut out certain qualities of beer from other States. It would require a Federal law to do this, and it would be a very serious matter if such a law were passed. The proposed New York standard, how could it be accomplished? All New York brewers would be required to produce their beer in accordance with the regulations of the State, and they would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere. It is a fact, however, that the beer brewed in New York would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere, and it would not only continue to send our brewers out of the business, but it would drive New York brewers out of the business. The State of New York has not the power to prescribe how beer brewed in other States should be sold, nor can it be forbidden to bring beer brewed in other States into the State of New York. The State has no right to interfere with the sale of beer brewed in other States, and it cannot shut out certain qualities of beer from other States. It would require a Federal law to do this, and it would be a very serious matter if such a law were passed. The proposed New York standard, how could it be accomplished? All New York brewers would be required to produce their beer in accordance with the regulations of the State, and they would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere. It is a fact, however, that the beer brewed in New York would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere, and it would not only continue to send our brewers out of the business, but it would drive New York brewers out of the business. The State of New York has not the power to prescribe how beer brewed in other States should be sold, nor can it be forbidden to bring beer brewed in other States into the State of New York. The State has no right to interfere with the sale of beer brewed in other States, and it cannot shut out certain qualities of beer from other States. It would require a Federal law to do this, and it would be a very serious matter if such a law were passed. The proposed New York standard, how could it be accomplished? All New York brewers would be required to produce their beer in accordance with the regulations of the State, and they would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere. It is a fact, however, that the beer brewed in New York would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere, and it would not only continue to send our brewers out of the business, but it would drive New York brewers out of the business. The State of New York has not the power to prescribe how beer brewed in other States should be sold, nor can it be forbidden to bring beer brewed in other States into the State of New York. The State has no right to interfere with the sale of beer brewed in other States, and it cannot shut out certain qualities of beer from other States. It would require a Federal law to do this, and it would be a very serious matter if such a law were passed. The proposed New York standard, how could it be accomplished? All New York brewers would be required to produce their beer in accordance with the regulations of the State, and they would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere. It is a fact, however, that the beer brewed in New York would be sold at a higher price than beer brewed elsewhere, and it would not only continue to send our brewers out of the business, but it would drive New York brewers out of the business. The State of New York has not the power to prescribe how beer brewed in other States should be sold, nor can it be forbidden to bring beer brewed in other States into the State of New York. The State has no right to interfere with the sale of beer brewed in other States, and it cannot shut out certain qualities of beer from other States. It would require a Federal law to do this, and it would be a very serious matter if such a law were passed. The proposed New York standard, how could it be accomplished? All New York brewers would be required to produce their beer in accordance with the regulations of the State,